

Remarks/Arguments:

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed April 30, 2008.

Claims 1-5, 7-20 and 24-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gehani (U.S. Patent No. 5,765,171) in view of Britton et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,613,060) and in further view of Abdallah et al. (“One-phase commit: does it make sense”).

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gehani in view of Britton and further in view of Mosher et al (U.S. 6,785,696).

Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gehani in view of Britton and further in view of Fiske (U.S. 6,324,692).

The independent claims include the feature that “wherein based on the type of delta, a one-phase update is done with the slave service layer requesting a delta from the master service layer asynchronously; or a two-phase update is done with the slave service layer receiving a delta from the master service layer, sending a prepared signal to the master service layer and then committing the delta if a commit signal is received from the master service layer, wherein the one-phase update is done to multiple slave servers concurrently”. This is not shown or made obvious by the cited prior art alone or in combination.

No one reference of the cited prior art is described that, based on the type of delta, does a one phase commit to multiple slave servers or doing a two phase commit. Abdallah describes a one phase commit to multiple recipients, but not the switching between a two phase and one phase commit based on the delta.

Further, it would not be obvious to modify Britton to send to multiple recipients as shown in Abdallah.

Britton teaches away from such a combination. Britton states that for a one phase commit in column 31, lines 36-39:

Since there can be only zero or one resources in update mode in the entire synchronization point, there is not chance of data inconsistency cause by different decisions for different resources.

The Examiner states that:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Gehani and Britton in view of Abdallah in order to enable the use of a one-phase update on multiple servers concurrently. One would be motivated to do so in order to minimize the time cost associated with coordination messages and forced lag writes in Two-Phase Commit (2PC).

However, this combination does not deal with the data consistency issue that Britton considers to be a problem with a one phase commit to multiple resources.

For the above reasons, the claims are believed to be allowable

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 30, 2008

By: /Joseph P. O'Malley/
Joseph P. O'Malley
Reg. No. 36,226

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800